Change History Log:

November 7th, 2000   **In Response Reply to: 01EDU0089S**
Department Of Education
Student Financial Assistance
Carol Seifert
Contracts Office Technical Representative

Subject: Contract # ED-99-DO-0002
         Task Order # 22 CIO Technical Support Team
         Deliverable 22.1.3 Applications Operations Approach

Dear Ms. Seifert:

Enclosed is the Applications Operations Approach that is required by the subject task order. Attached are suggested changes from the reviewers. Future revisions are not planned, but the document will be updated as appropriate.

Deliverable 22.1.3 Applications Operations Approach					
Suggested Changes/Comments	**Page**	**Author**	**Date**	**Change Made Y/N**	**Comment**
Overall these are boiler plate deliverables and very little effort has been made to customize them for SFA. In addition, it appears that very little QA was done as I will specify below.	All	Helene Epstein	10/24/00	Y	These original versions of the deliverables were the starting point we used for each of the individual Application Management efforts (Intranet, FMS, IFAP/Schools). Newer versions of the Application Profile, Transition Workplan, and Roles & Responsibilities Template have been included to show where we ended up with each of them.
Application profile - page 1, last column - change 1998 to 2000.	App Profile 1	Helene Epstein	10/24/00	Y	New version will be included.
Transition workplan: I went through this line by line and suggest AC management do the same. 1-1: why are all items under this n/a. I think they are applicable.	Work Plan 1	Helene Epstein	10/24/00	Y	New version will be included. n/a refers to distinct deliverables being produced. the tasks with n/a are applicable but separate deliverables will not be produced for them. they are covered in the higher level deliverable of "Arrangement Letter/Task Order"

Deliverable 22.1.3 Applications Operations Approach					
Suggested Changes/Comments	**Page**	**Author**	**Date**	**Change Made Y/N**	**Comment**
1-3: workplan and assumptions - who's paying for this?	Work Plan 3	Helene Epstein	10/24/00	N	Mod Ptr pays for the development of an estimate of work to be done (and assumptions) while we build a proposal. The workplan will be a living document and as we are transitioning applications, it must be updated. The time spent updating the plan is included in the task order and SFA pays for that.
3-4: What is the KX Contribution and CMAP, GSDL, CQMA, CI (looks like this is boilerplate).	Work Plan 4	Helene Epstein	10/24/00	N	The (Knowledge Exchange) KX contribution, CMAP, GSDL are internal Andersen processes. We normally include them so we can estimate our team members' true roll off dates. (These internal processes add a couple of days to the project end date). Andersen Consulting pays for these efforts; we use it to properly schedule our resources. Client Quality Management Assessment (CQMA) and Continuous Improvement (CI) are quality processes we use on our engagements. I do not know if Andersen or SFA pays for the time our CQMA partners spend on the engagement (Dave, do you know?). CI is included in our task orders and SFA pays for that as part of each task order.
all pages 2 - 5 are boilerplate and I question who's developing these processes and who's paying for this. The columns on this report assume you will be maintaining ombudsman, dw and tech art. I didn't know this was a done deal.	Work Plan all	Helene Epstein	10/24/00	N	It's not a done deal. We included it for completeness, understanding that SFA will need to do some form of transition with these applications.
This document needs to be reworked, customized and dates for start and end should be added. It is titled workplan but looks like a template to me.	Work Plan 1	Helene Epstein	10/24/00	Y	The title of this deliverable is "Template for Transition Workplans" on the Task Order. We will make sure the title is properly identified on the next version. Start and end dates were tracked throughout the project.

Andersen Consulting

Deliverable 22.1.3 Applications Operations Approach					
Suggested Changes/Comments	**Page**	**Author**	**Date**	**Change Made Y/N**	**Comment**
R&R template - this is clearly boilerplate and completely uncustomized. You are not doing operations, we don't have erp, ...	R&R Matrix All	Helene Epstein	10/24/00	Y	This template was useful in providing input to a similar template CSC had. We combined the best of both and I am now attaching the updated Roles & Responsibilities Matrix we will all be using.
Solution model: page 1 - I do not see QA in your task orders for app maintenance	Solution Model 1	Helene Epstein	10/24/00	N	Quality Assurance is included in the task order.
Page 2: why does this say FMS and that CSC will do the work - it's EDS. Was QA done on this document?	Solution Model 2	Helene Epstein	10/24/00	Y	FMS was removed. Document has been reviewed.
Page 3: The schools portal model is incorrect. Also, I can't read the portal boxes.	Solution Model 3	Helene Epstein	10/24/00	Y	At the time this was submitted, the Schools Portal model was our most current thinking. Since then, the model has changed and the most updated version has been included. The color of the boxes has been modified.